arXiv:1605.06685v1 [cond-mat.mtrl-sci] 21 May 2016

Analysis of High Power Behavior in Piezoelectric Ceramics from a Mechanical Energy Density Perspective

H. N. Shekhani[1], E. A. Gurdal[2], S. O. Ural[3], and K. Uchino[1]

May 24, 2016

[1]International Center for Actuators and Transducers, Materials Research Institute, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA
[2]Center for Dielectrics and Piezoelectrics, Materials Research Institute, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, USA
[3]Morgan Advanced Materials, Cleveland, Ohio, USA

Abstract

In this work, a new methodology for comparing high power performance of different piezoelectric materials is presented. When comparing high power performance of piezoelectric materials of varying compositions and vibration modes, there exists an inherent problem in comparing the mechanical quality factor directly. Typically the behavior of the mechanical quality factor is reported as a function of tip vibration velocity of the sample. This paper shows why this approach can be inherently problematic and proposes an energy approach to characterize the mechanical quality factor as the solution. By utilizing mechanical energy density (u_e), the mass density of the material system (ρ), and the vibration mode shape (e.g. k_{31} and k_p) of the sample are accounted for. Therefore, a better method to compare high power performance of varying piezoelectric compositions is introduced. Furthermore, the new method is applied to various compositions by using data available in the literature. As a result, the high power behavior of the materials appear to be significantly different when the new

"energy density approach" is used to compare the mechanical quality factor rather than vibration velocity. Also, the technique's ability to be utilized to consolidate data from different resonators to determine anisotropic loss factors is demonstrated on hard and soft PZT samples of k_{31} and k_p geometries.

1 Introduction

The measured properties of piezoelectric materials are sensitive to the conditions under which they are tested. Traditionally, piezoelectric materials are characterized under low amplitude excitation conditions, which provide different properties than that of large excitation, whose practical applications include popular transducers such as piezoelectric transformers and ultrasonic motors [1]. Therefore, many researchers have taken to study the high power characteristics of piezoelectric materials because the properties at high power levels are more relevant from an application standpoint. [2, 3, 4]

The mechanical quality factor (Q_m), is among the most critical properties for the design and application of high power piezoelectric transducers. The mechanical quality factor provides an amplification factor for strain and vibration in resonance conditions. The inverse of the mechanical quality factor provides a measure of the energy lost per cycle relative to the stored energy due to the hysteresis. Thus, the Q_m is a very important parameter to discuss when evaluating a material's high power performance. The high quality factor, or the "hardness" of the industry standard piezoelectric material, lead zirconate titanate (PZT), is achieved by acceptor doping the system and thereby generating internal field to suppress domain dynamics, the largest source of loss in this material system. With the recent environmental concerns due to lead content in PZT and other lead containing piezoelectric materials, many researchers are searching for lead free piezoelectric materials with a large mechanical quality factor to replace hard PZT for high power applications [5].

Many researchers have produced various promising materials which might replace PZT and other lead containing materials in high power applications[6, 7]. One of the objectives of this paper is to clarify a better method to compare the performance of different piezoelectric material systems in high power conditions. In order to compare materials having different sample dimensions, the vibration velocity condition has been used. This methodology is based

on the fact that the strain levels between samples with different dimensions are the same if they are under the same vibration velocity condition. Thus, the vibration condition can be used as a common excitation condition to compare results[8]. This, however, only applies to samples having the same mode of vibration. For example, the radial vibration mode of a disc sample (k_p) and the longitudinal vibration of a plate/bar sample (k_{31}) cannot be compared directly based on vibration velocity, as detailed in [9].

Comparing material properties based on vibration velocity seems natural, as it an easy to recognize its significance, and materials properties measured on samples having different dimensions can be compared. However, comparing the Q_m performance of material systems simply based on vibration velocity is not a complete solution. The first reason is already mentioned: the disc and the plate sample cannot be compared. This will be explained in greater detail in the next section, but to summarize the reason, the vibration velocity distribution profiles have different shapes. The second reason is that vibration velocity, although is not dependent on the size of the sample, is dependent on the stiffness or the density of the sample. It is simple to tell that a material with a higher mass density must have a higher mechanical energy to reach the same vibration velocity than a material with a lower mass density. However, simply judging from a vibration velocity perspective, both situations are equal.

The first goal of this paper is to prove analytically that vibration velocity alone may result in misleading conclusions when directly used to compare between material systems. Rather a new measure of excitation, mechanical energy density should be used. This methodology is demonstrated using published data from different material compositions in the literature. The second goal of this work is to show that energy density can be effectively used to determine anisotropic properties in high power conditions by providing a similar comparison metric between different piezoelectric resonators used to determine properties.

2 Theoretical Treatment

In this section, the non-dimensional quantity, mechanical energy density, will be presented to normalize the dependence of Q on material vibration performance. The mechanical energy will be expressed in terms of the maximum kinetic energy instead of the maximum elastic energy because the compliance

Table 1: Parameter definitions

Symbol	Description	Units
A	cross-sectional area of the plate	m^2
ρ	mass density	kg/m^3
$r(x,t)$	vibration distribution	m/s
V_{RMS}	RMS tip vibration velocity	m/s
n	mode number for plate (k_{31} mode)	–
f	frequency	1/s
$U_{e,31}$	energy of a plate oscillator	J
$U_{e,p}$	energy of a disc oscillator	J
$u_{e,31}$	energy density of a plate oscillator	J/m^3
$u_{e,p}$	energy density of a disc oscillator	J/m^3
θ	angle	rad
m	mode number for disc (k_p mode)	

of the materials undergo nonlinearities, whereas the mass density does not, thereby simplifying the calculations for practical measurements.

Parameters used in the theoretical derivations are summarized in Table 1. For the k_{31} mode, using the geometry shown in Fig. 1, the mechanical energy can be defined as the maximum kinetic energy, which is defined by the maximum vibration velocity distribution $r_{31,max}(x)$ [10]

$$U_{e,31} = \frac{1}{2} A \int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} \rho \left(r_{31,max}(x)\right)^2 \, \mathrm{dx}. \tag{1}$$

Assuming sinusoidal forcing at a frequency near the resonance frequency, the spatial vibration can be described as

$$r_{31}(x,t) = V_{RMS}\sqrt{2} \sin\left(n\frac{\pi x}{L}\right) \sin\left(2\pi f\, t\right) \tag{2}$$

and so the maximum velocity distribution is

$$r_{31,max}(x) = V_{RMS}\sqrt{2} \sin\left(\frac{n\pi x}{L}\right). \tag{3}$$

The mechanical energy can be defined as



Figure 1: Geometry of plate and disc

$$U_{e,31} = \frac{1}{2}A\int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} \rho\left(V_{RMS}\sqrt{2}\sin\left(\frac{n\pi x}{L}\right)\right)^2 dx \tag{4}$$

$$= V_{RMS}^2 2\rho\frac{1}{2}A\int_{-\frac{L}{2}}^{\frac{L}{2}} \sin^2\left(\frac{n\pi x}{L}\right) dx \tag{5}$$

$$= V_{RMS}^2\rho A\frac{L}{2}. \tag{6}$$

Dividing by the volume, the energy density of the ceramic is found

$$u_{e,31} = \frac{1}{2}\rho V_{RMS}^2. \tag{7}$$

Notice that the mechanical energy density does not depend on mode number nor on the geometrical dimensions, but it does depend on the mass density and the vibration velocity. It is proposed that this quantity should be com-

Table 2: Eigenvalue solutions for radially vibrating disc having free boundary conditions

m	$(\lambda R)_m$
1	2.049
2	5.389
3	8.572

pared between material compositions because this will be the value which will be most useful for applications.

For the k_p mode (radial vibration), the mechanical energy is described by the the maximum kinetic energy through the maximum vibration velocity distribution, $r_{p,max}(x,t)$, is [10]

$$U_{e,d}(x,t) = \frac{1}{2}a\int_0^R\int_0^{2\pi}\rho\left(r_{p,max}(x)\right)^2 x\,\mathrm{d}\theta\mathrm{dx} \tag{8}$$

Given that the plate is uniform with respect to the angular direction for the k_p mode, the integral with respect to θ can be evaluated

$$U_{e,d} = \pi\rho a\int_0^R\left(r_{p,max}(x)\right)^2 x\,\mathrm{dx}. \tag{9}$$

The mode shape (vibration velocity profile) for radial vibration of a disc is given by

$$r_p(x) = J_1(\lambda_m x) \tag{10}$$

where, J_1 is the Bessel function of the first kind, $\lambda_m = \frac{(\lambda R)_m}{R}$, and values of $(\lambda R)_m$ are shown in Table 2. Normalizing the mode shape to the tip vibration velocity,

$$r_{p,max}(x) = V_{RMS}\sqrt{2}\frac{J_1(\lambda_m x)}{J_1(\lambda_m R)} = V_{RMS}\sqrt{2}\frac{J_1(\lambda_m x)}{J_1((\lambda R)_m)}. \tag{11}$$

The energy of the disc oscillator can be described as



Figure 2: Mode shapes of vibration for longitudinal vibration (k_{31}, k_{33}, and k_t)



Figure 3: Mode shapes of vibration for radial vibration (k_p)

$$U_{e,p} = \pi\rho a \int_0^R \left(V_{RMS}\sqrt{2}\frac{J_1(\lambda_m x)}{J_1((\lambda R)_m)} \right)^2 x \, \mathrm{dx}. \tag{12}$$

By dividing by the volume, the mechanical energy density is described as

$$u_{e,p} = \frac{2\rho V_{RMS}^2 \int_0^R \left(\frac{J_1(\lambda_m x)}{J_1((\lambda R)_m)} \right)^2 x \, \mathrm{dx}}{R^2}. \tag{13}$$

Solving the integral, the energy density for the first three modes can be expressed as

$$u_{e,p,1} = 0.783\rho V_{RMS}^2 \tag{14}$$

$$u_{e,p,2} = 0.969\rho V_{RMS}^2 \tag{15}$$

$$u_{e,p,3} = 0.989\rho V_{RMS}^2 \tag{16}$$

The mechanical energy density increases with the vibration mode in discs because as the mode number increases the point of maximum vibration velocity does not occur at the tip velocity, although there is a local maximum of the vibration velocity at the edge of the sample due to the mechanical condition that the stress must be zero at the boundaries. This is different from the case of longitudinal vibration, where the edge vibration level is equal to or greater than the vibration occurring within the structure. The vibration velocity distribution (mode shape) of the longitudinal type and radial type vibration for the first three modes of vibration can be found in Figs. 2 and 3. Thus, normalizing the vibration velocity shape to the edge of the disc increases mechanical energy of the system. Practically, a lower vibration velocity is necessary to achieve a higher mechanical energy density in the case of the disc (radial vibration) in comparison to the plate (longitudinal vibration). Considering the first mode of vibration, the ratio between the mechanical energy density of plates and discs is

$$\frac{u_p}{u_{31}} = 1.57. \tag{17}$$

The edge vibration velocity in the plate and the edge vibration velocity in the disc which brings about the same mechanical energy density, assuming the mass density and volume is the same, is

$$\frac{V_{RMS,31}}{V_{RMS,p}} = 1.252. \tag{18}$$

It is proposed here that researchers use energy density when reporting material property values because energy density is a common comparison, both between different modes of vibration and between different compositions which have different mass densities (such as lead free and lead containing piezoceramics). Because different tensor properties contribute toward plate and disc vibration, the quality factor according to different tensor elastic properties are not theoretically equal. However, using mechanical energy density, the quality factor data measured from plate and disc samples will have a fair comparison. The derivation presented solves for the energy density as a function of vibration velocity, which results in the energy density being dependent on the mass density. The mechanical energy density can also be solved in terms of strain, in which case the energy density expression would depend on elastic compliance. This approach is not taken because the compliance has nonlinearity, whereas mass density is stable.

3 Analysis of Q_m according to mechanical energy density

3.1 Mechanical Energy Density as a Figure of Merit

Vibration velocity is commonly used as a figure of merit when comparing high power capabilities of piezoelectric materials. Furthermore, it can be proven that the strain level for samples with the same vibration velocity is the identical, allowing comparison of data between samples having different dimensions. However, this is true provided that the mode of vibration is the same. Also, if the material systems are different, the mass density can be significantly different, which means that the mechanical energy density of the compared materials will not be the same for a common vibration level. This can be clearly seen in Eqs. 7 and 14 where the mechanical energy density is proportional to the mass density.

The authors of this paper propose that mechanical energy density should be used as a common comparison condition for high power properties instead of solely using vibration velocity. This is because the vibration velocity does not account for the effects of vibration mode type and material density. By utilizing the mechanical energy density approach, one will be in effect normalizing the vibration velocity such that the materials can be suitably compared. In most applications, the piezoelectric materials will be working against an external load, be it a resistive load for a piezoelectric transformer, or a physical load for an ultrasonic motor. Such conditions are imposing on the material to work on external environments, in which cases energy density is a better figure of merit than vibration velocity.

3.2 Analysis of High Power Behavior by using Mechanical Energy Density as a Figure of Merit

In this portion, high power behavior of three distinctly different piezoelectric materials (i.e. Bi-based, alkaline-based, lead-based) will be analyzed using the new mechanical energy density approach. For the purposes of comparison, results from BNKLT based ($0.88(Bi_{0.5}Na_{0.5})TiO_3$ $-0.04(Bi_{0.5}Li_{0.5})TiO_3$ $-0.08(Bi_{0.5}Na_{0.5})TiO_3$+$MnCO_3$ 0.4 wt%)[11], KN based ($KNbO_3$ + $MnCO_3$ 0.8 wt%)[11], BNT–BT–BNMN based ($0.82(Bi_{0.5}Na_{0.5})TiO_3$ –$0.15BaTiO_3$ –$0.03(Bi_{0.5}Na_{0.5})$ $(Mn_{1/3}Nb_{2/3})O_3$)[12], commercial hard PZT ($Pb(Zr, Ti)O_3$)[11], and NKN based (($Na_{0.5}K_{0.5}$) $(Nb_{0.97}Sb_{0.03})O_3$ +CuO 1.5 %) [13] ceramics found in the literature were used. The samples used in these studies feature longitudinal vibration of a plate shape (k_{31}), except for NKN [13], where a disc sample was used having radial vibration (k_p). The properties at low level excitation for the various materials can be found in Tab. 3. Regarding high power measurements, the studies from [11] and [12] used the burst/transient method to determine the mechanical quality factor according to vibration velocity. In the burst method, the sample receives large field excitation for a set number of cycles, after which the excitation is removed and the vibration is allowed to decay. By measuring the rate of decay using current measurement, the mechanical quality factor can be calculated [2]. Gurdal et al. measured the mechanical quality factor under continuous excitation at the given vibration velocity[13] . This was accomplished by controlling the voltage input while sweeping the frequency across the resonance frequency while logging impedance. Using the 3dB bandwidth of the impedance around the resonance



Figure 4: Change in mechanical factor with increasing vibration level

frequency, the mechanical quality factor can be calculated.

Figure 4 shows the change in the mechanical quality factor as a result of change in the peak vibration velocity. This figure shows that the quality factor tends to degrade with increasing vibration levels. The degree to which each material degrades is associated with onset of domain wall motion, but that is not the point of discussion of this paper. With increasing vibration levels the lead-free material systems seem to maintain their low power Q_m values with minimal degradation, while the Q_m of PZT degrades very quickly. From this figure, it is apparent that all the Pb-free materials shown exceed the quality factor of the PZT sample when the vibration velocity is large enough. BNKLT exceeds the quality factor of PZT at 0.57 m/s, BNT-BT-BNMN at 0.64 m/s, KN at 0.71 m/s, and NKN at 0.53 m/s.

Figure 5 shows the change in the mechanical quality factor as a change in the mechanical energy density. The end of each of the curves has a tip vibration velocity of 1 m/s, except NKN whose is 0.57 m/s. Using mechanical energy density, the vibration velocity for each system is effectively normalized with its density and vibration mode. Looking at this figure, it is apparent that the quality factor of KN no longer exceeds that of PZT for any mechanical energy condition. This is because after taking into consider-



Figure 5: Change in mechanical quality factor with mechanical energy density

Material	d_{31}(pC/N)	s_{11}^E(pm^2/N)	$Q_{m,31}$	$\rho(kg/m^3)$	Reference
BNKLT	20	7.6	730	5800	[11]
KN	25	7.7	820	4300	[11]
NKN	99 (d_{33})	-	1051 ($Q_{m,p}$)	4280	[13]
Hard PZT	125	12.1	1800	7900	[11]
BNT–BT–BNMN	110 (d_{33})	8.8(s_{33}^E)	500($Q_{m,33}$)	5500	[12]

Table 3: Material properties under low level excitation

ation the low mass density of KN, its performance becomes less significant. BNT-BT-BNMN exceeds the quality factor of PZT at a mechanical energy condition of 850 J/m^3. This corresponds to the vibration velocity condition of 0.76 m/s for BNT-BT-BNMN and 0.64 m/s for PZT. BNKLT exceeds the quality factor of PZT for mechanical energy densities of higher than 700 J/m^3, which corresponds to a vibration condition of 0.64 m/s for BNKLT and 0.55 m/s for PZT, which is different from the conclusion which could be made from Figure 4, where the Q_m of BNKLT exceeded that of PZT at 0.5 m/s. NKN exceeded the quality factor of the PZT at 540 J/m^3, which is equivalent to 0.56 m/s for NKN and 0.53 m/s for PZT.

The general trend observed is that the quality factor of the lead-free materials does not suffer from the sharp degradation as the commercial PZT sample does. As a result, although the mechanical quality factors of the lead-free materials are lower at low vibration velocities, they are higher past a sufficiently high mechanical excitation level. For all of the k_{31} samples, the equivalent mechanical energy density condition resulted in a larger vibration velocity for the lighter lead-free sample rather than the more dense PZT. Because the energy density takes into account mass density when calculating the performance level, the performance of PZT is apparently enhanced because of its large density. A larger vibration velocity is required from the lighter lead-free materials to reach the equivalent vibration velocity for the heavier PZT. With regards to NKN, the k_p sample, the equivalent mechanical energy density condition yields an almost identical vibration velocity for the PZT and the NKN material system. This is because, the lighter density of NKN reduces its relative performance to the more dense PZT, but the mode of vibration of the NKN sample (k_p) increases its performance. That being said, the density or the vibration mode does not actually enhance or the increase the degradation characteristics of the material. In fact, the mechanical energy density approach presented allows one to remove their effects and to compare material properties in a better justified manner.

The purpose of this section was to demonstrate the observations made comparing Q_m performance as a function of vibration velocity and as a function of mechanical energy density will be different. Comparison of the Q_m degradation of materials using vibration velocity as the common condition has limitations, as was discussed. Although general trends seen using vibration velocity as the figure of merit still hold true when observing the mechanical quality factor with regard to mechanical energy density, relative material performance can best be evaluated when utilizing mechanical energy

density as the common comparison condition.

3.3 Comparison of Q_A in k_{31} and k_p resonators through energy density

The energy density versus Q_A is plotted in Fig. 6 for hard and soft PZT of k_{31} and k_p resonator geometries. This data was taken using the burst method operated at antiresonance. After accounting for the energy density of each mode type (k_{31} and k_p) and the mass density of the material, the quality factors of both modes agree, showing they are comparable between different modes. Previously, it may have seemed as though the k_p degrades quickly; however, this is due to the increased energy density stored per unit of vibration velocity. That being said, the k_p mode's energy potential is omni-directional in the plane of vibration, which may make it difficult to apply this resonator in devices. However, in applications such as structural health monitoring and piezoelectric transformers, this feature can be effectively utilized, in which case it is important to be able to compare the modes. Anisotropy is a fundamental quality of piezoelectric materials, which implies that losses are also anisotropic. Thus, although the quality factor for the k_{31} and k_p modes in this analysis were of similar levels, it is not possible to assume this generalize to all crystalline piezoelectric ceramics.

4 Conclusion

Analysis of the mechanical quality factor (Q_m) as a function of vibration velocity is typically used to compare the high power behavior of piezoelectric materials. Using vibration velocity as a figure of merit might be misleading if distinctly different materials and vibration modes are compared. In this paper, a new figure of merit is introduced to compare high power behavior of different piezoelectric materials: mechanical energy density. The formulas describing the mechanical energy density were solved for longitudinal vibration (k_{31}, k_{33}, and k_t) and radial vibration (k_p) type transducers. The new analysis method was applied to data regarding lead-free (i.e. KN, BNKLT, BNT-BT-BNMN, NKN) and lead-based (hard PZT) piezoelectric materials found in the literature. Analyzing mechanical quality factor as a function mechanical energy density gave different conclusions than analyzing it with regard to vibration velocity. When analyzing Q_m behavior versus vibration



(a)



(b)

Figure 6: Comparison of the resonance quality factor Q_A versus vibration velocity (a) and energy density (b) in hard (PIC 181) and soft PZT (APC 850)

velocity, all lead-free ceramics surpassed hard-PZT. However, when analyzing Q_m behavior versus mechanical energy lead-free ceramics Q_m the trends observed differed. As a result, comparing the high power of behavior of different materials with mechanical energy density provides a better standard of comparison between different materials and different sample geometries than vibration velocity. This is because mechanical energy density accounts for the mass density of the material system and also accounts for type of vibration, thereby normalizing vibration velocity to mechanical energy density. The mechanical energy density approach is necessary to compare mechanical loss in piezoelectric ceramics for different material systems and vibration modes. Finally, the energy density concept was applied to hard and soft PZT materials of k_p and k_{31} resonator geometries.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge the support by funding from The Office of Naval Research (ONR) Grant Number: ONR N00014-12-1-1044.

References

[1] K. Uchino, *Ferroelectric Devices 2nd Edition*. CRC Press, 2009.

[2] M. Umeda, K. Nakamura, and S. Ueha,*Japanese journal of applied physics*, vol. 37, no. part 1, pp. 5322–5325, 1998.

[3] S. Hirose, M. Aoyagi, Y. Tomikawa, S. Takahashi, and K. Uchino, *Ultrasonics*, vol. 34, pp. 213 – 217, 1996. Proceedings of Ultrasonics International 1995.

[4] K. Uchino, J. Zheng, A. Joshi, Y.-H. Chen, S. Yoshikawa, S. Hirose, S. Takahashi, and J. de Vries, *Journal of Electroceramics*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 33–40, 1998.

[5] K. Uchino and J. Giniewicz, *Micromechatronics*. CRC Press, 2003.

[6] T. Takenaka, K. ichi Maruyama, and K. Sakata, *Japanese Journal of Applied Physics*, vol. 30, no. 9S, p. 2236, 1991.

[7] T. Shrout and S. Zhang, *Journal of Electroceramics*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 113–126, 2007.

[8] K. Uchino, *Ferroelectric Devices*. Materials engineering, Taylor & Francis, 2000.

[9] S. O. Ural, Y. Zhuang, S. Tuncdemir, and K. Uchino, *Japanese Journal of Applied Physics*, vol. 49, no. 2R, p. 021502, 2010.

[10] W. Soedel, *Vibrations of Shells and Plates, Third Edition*. Dekker Mechanical Engineering, Taylor & Francis, 2004.

[11] H. Nagata, Y. Hiruma, and T. Takenaka, *Integrated Ferroelectrics*, vol. 115, no. 1, pp. 63–70, 2010.

[12] T. Tou, Y. Hamaguti, Y. Maida, H. Yamamori, K. Takahashi, and Y. Terashima,

Japanese Journal of Applied Physics, vol. 48, no. 7S, p. 07GM03, 2009.

[13] E. Gurdal, S. Ural, H.-Y. Park, S. Nahm, and K. Uchino, *Sensors and Actuators A: Physical*, vol. 200, no. 0, pp. 44 – 46, 2013. Selected Papers from the 9th International Workshop on Piezoelectric Materials and Applications in Actuators.